

REVILO PENDLETON OLIVER

1908 • 1994

## THE LAST STAND

by Professor Revilo P. Oliver (*Liberty Bell*, November 1987)

I HAVE RECEIVED a copy of a book, first published in 1936 and now reprinted by the Christian Book Club of Hawthorne, California (price unstated). It may fairly be described as the last stand of what I call Western Christianity, the religion that was for so long accepted by our race, and which has now been almost totally extinguished by the Judaeo-Christian cult that has monopolized virtually all pulpits and provided so lucrative a racket for the rabble-rousing hokum-peddlers of electronic evangelism. The author contends that, as is certainly true, Western Christianity was basically an Occidental religion, although it brought with it numerous and potentially ruinous Jewish accretions.

The book propounds an hypothesis that is historically *possible*, and therefore to be sharply distinguished from the bizarre cult now in vogue in some insignificantly small circles, called "British Israel" or "Identity," which is not only historically preposterous but is contumelious and insulting to our race.

Instead of claiming that the filthy, vicious, and barbarous tribe of swindlers and marauders whose disgusting exploits are described in the "Old Testament" were Aryans, which is ethnologically injurious as well as historically absurd, Dr. Jacob Elon Conner (1862-c.1940) contends that the founder of Christianity was an Aryan. His book bears the title, *Christ Was Not a Jew*. His thesis is one that, like many other astonishing propositions, cannot be categorically *disproved*, and is therefore entitled to fair and judicious consideration.

You will be offended by the title, which is tantamount to saying "Manager is not a nigger," using a title as a personal name. Dr. Conner did not know, or more probably just ignored, the fact that 'christ' is the English derivative of a Greek word that the Jews oddly adopted in their Yiddish dialect of *koine* Greek to translate the Hebrew word that also appears in English as 'messiah.' For this misuse of the word Dr. Conner had sufficient reasons, for, although he never specifically confronts the question, he would certainly contend that 'Jesus' either (a) was not really the name of the person so called in the "New Testament," or (b) was given him as an alien and racially misleading name, as was done, for example, to Sir Isaac Newton and Thomas Jefferson, neither of whom was a Sheeny, although the first bore the name of a mythical Jewish hero and the second was baptized with the Aramaic word for 'twin.' For that matter, Dr. Conner himself was an Aryan, but had imposed on him in infancy the name of a celebrated Jewish scoundrel, who, true to his racial instincts, swindled even his own father.

Dr. Conner really produces a doctrine essentially that of Marcion, of whom he seems not to have heard. I have frequently mentioned the Marcionist version of early Christianity, especially in connection with the effort of the late Dr. David Hamblin to

revive it. It was the earliest form of Christianity that became current among fairly civilized peoples and appears to have had, for a time, the greatest number of such adherents and to have been the major Christian cult. Until quite recently (and *possibly* even now), the oldest extant inscription from a Christian church came from a Marcionist church that was destroyed in the persecutions begun by the so-called Fathers of the Church as soon as they got their hot hands on governmental power and could use it to suppress competition.

Dr. Conner, apparently without knowing it, undertook the task Dr. Hamblin set himself *à bon escient*. He tried to salvage Christianity by formulating a Marcionist theology, unaware that Marcion had done so in the Second Century. Had he known of his predecessor, he would surely have lamented the virtually complete destruction of the Marcionists' Christian gospels, and he could very profitably have argued from the pitifully exiguous traces of those gospels that we now have to their probable content as confirmation of his thesis.

He would also have had to face the inescapable historical question why the motley gang of shysters known as the Fathers of the Church gave first priority to exterminating a prevalent version of Christianity which clearly separated that religion from the Jews' barbarous superstitions -- why the Fathers of the Church, many of whom sought popularity by denouncing the Jews, made such desperate and finally successful efforts to saddle Christianity with the grotesque and poisonous filth of the Jews' book, which they called an "Old Testament," and thus identified their deity with the ferocious Yahweh who had chosen the parasitic race as his pets and, like them, hated civilized mankind -- until he supposedly changed his muddled mind in the First Century.

I shall try to summarize Dr. Conner's argument, which I commend to the attention of everyone who is seriously interested in Christianity, whether believer or skeptic.(1) I shall have to begin, however, by clarifying, as concisely as I can, the relevant geographical and historical considerations.

(1. I shall not waste time calling attention to minor historical errors, none of which is crucial to the argument, and most of which come from Dr. Conner's sources. The worst, perhaps, is his reliance on Dr. L. A. Waddell's *Makers of Civilization* (London, 1929; reprinted, New Delhi, 1968). Waddell was a learned man whose error in trying to read Sumerian as an Indo-European language was less gross than that of almost all of his contemporaries, who were trying to read it as a Semitic tongue. The real howler in the present volume was made by the anonymous author of the nineteen pages of Addenda, which include, in addition to valuable supplements of Dr. Conner's work, a purported letter from Pontius Pilate, which the Reverend Mr. William Dennis Mahan was inspired by his piety to forge in 1879, apparently without knowledge of the several forgeries produced by the Christians in early centuries of the present era.)

## THE GALILEANS

The christ who is the hero of the "New Testament" is said to have been a Galilean, born in Galilee, which was a land populated by the residue of the many peoples and races that had dominated or traversed it from time to time during five millennia. A considerable part of the residual population was of Aryan descent at the time the territory became part of the empire of Alexander the Great, under whom and his successors Greeks (including Macedonians) occupied the cities as the ruling class and made them centers of their high culture and civilization.

The territory called Galilee (of which the boundaries were always fluid and uncertain) was bordered on the south by Samaria, which was likewise populated by the residue of many nations, and had likewise been given a high culture by the Greeks, who made the

capital city, Samaria, a colony of Macedonians released from Alexander's armies.

South of Samaria lay Judaea, where the woes of Palestine began when Cyrus the Great conquered the Babylonian Empire and in 538 B.C. occupied the great city of Babylon, which was betrayed to him by the hordes of Jews who were swarming in that center of commerce. To reward them for their treason, and also, no doubt, in the hope that he could induce the treacherous parasites to leave his new territories, Cyrus gave them (as did the British twenty-six centuries later) the right to impose themselves on the natives of Palestine. Although most of the Jews frustrated Cyrus's hopes by remaining in Babylon to prey on the population and international commerce, a swarm of them did occupy Judaea and start kicking the natives around. That territory, therefore, was held by the ancient Zionists when Alexander the Great conquered the Persian Empire.

### **ZIONIST AGGRESSION**

During the wars of the Diadochi which followed the death of Alexander, the Zionists, with the open and surreptitious help of the colonies their parasitic race had established throughout the civilized world, and by cozening several Aryan governments (including the Roman), flourished in Judaea, and in the second century B.C. began to expand their territory in much the same way as their modern successors, i.e., by invading adjacent territories, slaughtering the valuable part of the population, and forcing their savage god's religion on the lower classes, who were retained in a servile status to cultivate the ground and perform manual labor, which is, as we all know, beneath the dignity of Yahweh's Master Race. Their aggression and expansion was made possible by the wars between the civilized nations that had interests in Palestine and the clandestine support of the Jews lodged in their territories. A particularly notable case occurred in 103 or 102 B.C., when the Zionists were saved by the Jews whom the Queen of Egypt, Cleopatra III, had foolishly permitted to attain positions of authority in her government and army.

It is not known what intrigues and influences led the Seleucid king, Antiochus VII, who had sternly repressed the Zionists' aggression on their neighbors in his domains, to make, in 132 B.C., the foolish and fatal blunder of overruling the advisers who urged him to clean out the Judaeian pest-hole and populate it with races amenable to civilization. His tragic blunder and his subsequent defeat by the Parthians permitted the Zionists, under a Jew who had assumed the civilized name of Hyrcanus, to resume their aggressions.

They invaded the territory of Samaria, surreptitiously assisted, of course, by the Jews who had infiltrated it as traders, tavern-keepers, usurers and other predators, and also by a large body of peasantry, of uncertain race but probably Semitic, who had earlier accepted the cult of Yahweh. In 120 B.C. the Zionists' mercenary troops stormed the capital city, the last stronghold of the Macedonians. Then followed, naturally, the wholesale slaughter of *goyim* that always brings the bliss of righteousness to Jewish hearts, and the forced conversion of the survivors to the cult of Yahweh, including, with wonted sadism, circumcision, which was inflicted on all males, with death as the only alternative. One purpose of the coerced conversion, of course, was to ensure the docility of the Judaized serfs, who, as farmers, artisans, and the like, were to serve their Zionist masters.

The eldest son of Hyrcanus, who called himself Aristobulus and simulated a great admiration of Greek civilization to further his ambitions, began the Zionist conquest of Galilee, which was completed by his brother and successor, Alexander Jannaeus, who was remarkable, even among Jews, for the ferocity of his conquests and rule. We may be certain that Galilee, like Samaria, had been infiltrated by Jewish predators, who

facilitated the Zionist conquest, but there is no evidence of a body of peasantry comparable to the group of worshippers of Yahweh in Samaria. The conquest, naturally, proceeded as in Samaria, with slaughter and conversion at sword's point of the survivors, almost all of the lower classes, to the worship of Yahweh.

In connection with these conversions we should note a point which, if my recollection is not at fault, was first shrewdly made by Dr. Conner. He was thinking of Aryans, but it is equally applicable to Semites. Polytheistic peoples in general believe, reasonably enough, that every place, countryside, forest, river, fountain, lake, and mountain, has its own *genius loci*, while a superior deity may preside over a city or territory as its *deus loci*. The concept, which is familiar to everyone from Classical literature, survived in Christianity, notably in the Catholic cult of shrines.(2) There is a Jewish tradition, for what it is worth, that at a much earlier date the ferocious Jew-god became established in the territory of Samaria as its *deus loci*. It is stated in the Jew-Book (*Reg. IV = Kings II*, 17.26-27) that the Samaritans, who, of course, were not Jews, were induced to accept Yahweh as the 'god of the land,' on the grounds that Samaria had earlier been infested by Kikes, whose god had probably remained in the hills after the Jews were deported. The Samaritans, we are told, added the local god to their pantheon, but many of them had the good sense to retain as much of their own superior cults as they could, just as the superficially Christianized peasantry throughout Europe retained much of their native 'pagan' religions (e.g., the trees and other symbols that were used in celebration of the Winter Solstice and so retained when that festivity was called Christmas). Some Samaritans, perhaps under coercion, gave exclusive adherence to the Jews' god and so became the ancestors of the Yahwist peasants I mentioned above.

(2. I gave an especially clear example in [\*Liberty Bell\*, September 1985, pp. 10-11.](#))

The unfortunate Galileans of the lower classes, on whom the Zionists, with their racial arrogance and animosity, forced their savage god and their barbarous rites as the alternative to massacre, were, as we have said, a polyphyletic population that probably included a fairly large number of descendants of early Aryans (how large a percentage we have no means of knowing), who, belonging to the peasantry, had lost most of their culture, but probably retained, perhaps subconsciously, their racial instincts, at least to some extent. Like the other Galileans, they doubtless suffered much from the smoldering civil war among the Jews that began in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, when the Pharisees, who were racially incapable of civilization, revolted against the Jewish aristocracy, who were Sadducees from policy or culture.(3)

(3. It is likely that many of the Sadducees, who tried to become civilized, were sincere in their defection from Judaism. They were exterminated by the Jewish majority with its fanatical and insuperable hatred of civilized mankind.)

We can well believe that oppressed peoples, who had been forced to conform to the Jews' religion, at least potentially resented their overbearing and insolent masters. Such was the situation in Galilee near the end of the first century B.C., when, according to Christian chronology, was born the individual whom I, in discussing Dr. Conner's work, shall call 'Christ' to avoid the personal name which he does not use.

### 'CHRIST'

Dr. Conner believes that his 'Christ' was racially an Aryan, belonging to the peasantry, who, perforce, conformed, at least outwardly, to the Judaism that had been so ruthlessly imposed on them, but may have been like the natives of lands that were Christianized in recent times, who conformed to Christian customs and attended churches, without becoming real votaries of the alien religion, which they interpreted

in terms of their own mentality, if they did not simply reject it in secret.

He admits, therefore, that 'Christ' was subjected at birth to the Jews' savage and disgusting rite of circumcision,(4) that his Aryan parents and he conformed to Jewish customs, accepted the rabbis as religious authorities, and were probably ignorant of the religions of more civilized peoples, except insofar as the peasants heard rumors from outside about cults they had been taught to abhor. All that is undeniably possible.

(4. Which is physically and psychologically highly injurious, at least to persons of our race, and quite possibly even to children of the Jewish race and thus a means of inducing their participation in the racial fanaticism and hatred that gives that race its solidarity against all other peoples. On the funeste effects of this savage rite, see the admirably concise book by Nicholas Carter, *Routine Circumcision: the Tragic Myth* (London, Londinium Press, 1979).)

Dr. Conner contends, furthermore, that all specific statements in the "New Testament" to the effect that 'Christ' was a Jew, such as the obviously spurious and conflicting genealogies in the gospels attributed to Matthew and 'Luke,'(5) are interpolations and forgeries, which he imputes chiefly to the Jewish sect of Ebionites, who are known to have contributed to the "New Testament" the horrible Apocalypse and most of the "Epistle to the Hebrews" which is circulated under the name of Paul, although it cannot be the work of any of the authors of the other epistles attributed to him.

(5. There never was a man named in Greek *Loukas*, any more than we have men named 'Texan' or 'Georgian.' The adjective is territorial and simply means 'a man from Lucania,' a region of which the capital city was Luca, modern Lucca.)

Here, of course, we come to the fatal defect of Christianity, its Bible. Dr. Conner, like Marcion, simply jettisons the whole of the vile "Old Testament," so questions about its text are irrelevant, and makes the religion depend exclusively on the "New Testament." But his "New Testament," his only source of information about what the earnest Aryan peasant advocated, is the collection that was put together by the Fathers of the Church, who selected for inclusion gospels and other screeds which, according to Dr. Conner's theory, had already been heavily interpolated and distorted by the Jews.

Now we can usually detect, by linguistic and stylistic tests, interpolations in first-rate authors for whom we have a generally sound text (e.g., spurious lines in Ovid), but when we are dealing with a collection of tales by numerous writers, all of them low-grade, the problem becomes philologically insoluble and the only criteria are internal consistency and historical plausibility. And when we have a collection of stories for which there is no independent verification, the certainty that large parts must be spurious invites the conclusion that the whole may be equally fictitious.

That is particularly true when we are dealing with stories told by Jews, a race for whom forgery is as natural as breathing, as Dr. Conner himself must concede. So, even for the "New Testament," as for the Bible as a whole, we come to the necessary conclusion that if the text is not 'inerrant,' but contains much that is indubitably false and intended to deceive, then, even if some parts of it are genuine, we have no secure means of distinguishing them from the rest, and since there is no means of verifying any of them, the only safe procedure is to reject the whole.

With so much of a *caveat*, let us continue with Dr. Conner's argument, having conceded that his theory that 'Christ' was an Aryan peasant in Galilee is *possible* and cannot be disproved, which, of course, is very far from making it probable.(6)

(6. He does impose some strain on our credulity when he argues that his 'Christ' went into Judaea because he recognized it as the pest-hole of the inhabited world, from which sprang the parasites who preyed upon and afflicted the low-class population of his native Galilee.

Of course, all passages in the "New Testament" which state or suggest that he was a would-be messiah are Jewish forgeries. Dr. Conner's 'Christ' wanted only to persuade the Jews to abandon a religion that was incompatible with civilization and the instincts of decent men. He had nothing to do with the Jesus who is a segment of the composite god invented by the dominant sect of Christians and bizarrely and most implausibly identified with Yahweh.)

## RACIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Conner's major and more cogent argument is generally similar to the one familiar from Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, but is expressed more trenchantly and with less conciliatory concession. It is the utter incompatibility of Christianity as it is generally understood with the Jewish mentality.

Christianity, even in the debased form peddled by the salvation-hucksters of television, purports to be a universal religion, available to everyone on equal terms. That is a conception foreign and possibly incomprehensible to the Jewish mind. "Judaism as a world religion," says Dr. Conner, "is a contradiction in terms." That is indubitable, except in the sense that the Jews' racial religion can be understood as embracing the world in the way explicitly stated in the Talmuds, according to which Jews are species of life vastly superior to all others and the only people who may properly be called human and who have "human rights," especially the right to own property. Aryans, Mongolians, and others, though biped, have no more rights than swine and, like swine, cannot own property, so whatever they have really belongs to the Jews, who naturally and justly take it from them by fraud and deceit when it is not safe to do so by force.

Dr. Conner enforces this argument by an admirable analysis of the Jews' innate and genetically determined character. He points out, by the way, that much of what makes some Jewish writings acceptable and even attractive to Occidentals really comes from the Occidental languages into which they were translated from Hebrew, a crude and primitive language, "about like Choctaw," and inadequate for expressing logical thought or factually accurate narrative.(7) Had the Jews' Holy Book remained in their sacred dialect of Old Phoenician (Western Semitic), it would be regarded today as a curious relic of Oriental barbarism, below the level of, e.g., Babylonian and far inferior to Arabic. When the Jews translated their collection of myths into *koine* Greek, a language alien to their native mentality, which they learned much as they learn English today, the language forced them to make the translation much more specific and coherent than the original. And when that original was translated into English (on the basis of the Septuagint's rendering of the Hebrew), the zealous translators gave it a literary grace and force that, for the most part, they supplied and read into the rebarbative original.

(7. Languages, of course, are an index to the mentality of the races that use them. And, whatever may be said by the nihilists who assert that everything is as good as everything else, our appraisal of all languages that are not Indo-European must be made in terms of our own racial mentality. A good contrast between Jewish and civilized thinking will be found in Professor Thorleif Borman's *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, c.1960). As a professional theologian, Borman presents Hebrew in the best possible light, but cannot conceal the vast difference in mental processes. He could have gone much farther. Dr. Conner's summary, in which he mentions only the fundamental difference in the verbs, is adequate for most purposes. One such significant detail will suggest the whole. *Ex ungue leonem!* )

Ethnologically, Dr. Conner's conclusions may surprise some who do not expect them to have been apparent in 1936. On the basis of blood tests that were then available (and, of course, long before the publication of the elaborate haematological analysis by Dr. A. E. Mourant that I have so frequently cited), Dr. Conner concluded rightly that the Jews are a hybrid race, principally combining Semitic and Negroid blood, and probably

including a variety of minor strains from already mongrelized Semites and Negroes. On the basis of some slight historical indications, he plausibly concludes that the Jews originated in the land called Ethiopia, which took its name from the Semites of Arabia Felix who invaded and conquered it and then destroyed themselves by miscegenation with the indigenous niggers -- the land that in modern times and until recently was known by a more descriptive and accurate name, Abyssinia ('land of mongrels'). This, the author remarks, explains the fact that although the Jews had Semitic blood, spoke a Semitic language (Aramaic), and had sacred books in a Semitic dialect known to their rabbis, there has always been an instinctive antipathy between Jews and the Arabs and other real Semites.

Dr. Conner sees that the Jews purloined their Biblical tales from superior peoples and then Judaized and degraded them. He gives a neat contrast between the crudity of the few ethical parts of the "Ten Commandments" and the more comprehensive and superior ethics of an Egyptian Prayer to Osiris, written many centuries before the world was, so far as is known, afflicted with Jews. Maurice Samuel has told us authoritatively that Jews always conceive their Yahweh as a big Jew, and Dr. Conner reached the same conclusion, that Yahweh is "a magnified Jew, the personification of their race, the embodiment of Jewish needs, desires, ambitions, and that exclusively... The [primitive and "post-simian"] rite of circumcision... together with the denial of property rights to those outside of their race, still persist as fundamental characteristics of Judaism, for they are embedded in the racial nature of the Jew to an ineradicable degree. One may read in the Talmud today that none but Jews have any right to private property whatsoever."

He contends, quite plausibly, that no Jew could honestly and sincerely propose a religion that would cancel his race's innate right to own the world, and that therefore to believe that 'Christ' was a Jew is to assume a psychological impossibility.

### YAHWEH'S RACE

The most valuable and cogent part of Dr. Conner's book is his concise analysis of Jewish character as disclosed by the race's activity throughout recorded history. This part of the book I commend to everyone who takes serious thought about our plight today, whether or not he is interested in religions.

The author forthrightly dismisses the cavils and qualms of persons who are acquainted with Jews who are, or seem to be, kindly and inoffensive, even cultured. Races, like other biological species, must be judged as a whole, and this is particularly true of a versipellous race that instinctively uses deception as a weapon in its clandestine war on all other races. Regardless of how properly you may like individual Jews, and granting the likelihood that many of them are honest and sincere, Dr. Conner tells us that "we *must* indict the whole race, for the 'good Jews' do not denounce the racial program." A clear and cogent argument can be drawn from the consideration that if our country is invaded, we must destroy the invading army, regardless of the possibility that there may be in it men whom we would personally like; and even if we have met and do like some individuals in it, that fact is simply irrelevant in the military situation.

Throughout history, the Jews have always and invariably attacked nations by infiltrating their territory under specious disguises, and then applying gradually the method that Dr. Conner perfectly summarizes in one short sentence: "*First defile, then destroy.*" That says it all. If you know that, you can understand all the rest. The Jews subvert nations they attack by preconizing virtues and "social goods" that are the opposite of their own covert racial standards but serve to anaesthetize their victims and make them docile prey. They agitate for "equality" to facilitate the imposition of their

own immeasurable superiority, and for "economic justice" to mask their conviction that all the property in the world justly belongs to them. They preach "tolerance" to facilitate their own intolerant hatred of all other races, whom they regard as lower animals. They denounce "racism" and agitate for "human rights," with the secret reservation that they are the only race that is human.

The Jews always whine about "prejudice" and "persecution." On this Dr. Conner remarks: "Parasites are always 'persecuted,' or deserve to be. The much-advertised 'pogroms' in Russia were no more than a parasite had a right to expect -- hardships in return for parasitic practices. If a race finds a Jew to be obnoxious in manners or otherwise, it is not persecution or prejudice to shun him, nor even to use harsh measures to get rid of him."

Dr. Conner wrote, of course, before the Jews concocted their grandiose hoax about a "Holocaust" and manufactured to support it the innumerable fictions and forgeries (e.g., "Anne Frank's Diary") that they are now trying to impose on their sentimentally thoughtless victims, but the Jews have been whining about "persecution" for millennia, as instinctively as a mosquito whines about your ear before inserting his proboscis to draw your blood.(8)

(8. Coincidentally, a review in the current issue of *Speculum* sent me to a little book published by the Jewish Institute of Religion of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati in 1984, *The '1007 Anonymous' and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in the High Middle Ages*. The author, Kenneth R. Stow, who must be a Jew despite his name, examines a Jewish account of a horrible persecution of God's Darlings in northern France in the early Eleventh Century, and finds in it gross anachronisms that force him to conclude that the "persecution" never took place, and that the reports of it were forged in the Thirteenth Century to support the Jews' claim that only the Papacy had legal authority over their international race, since they could always be assured of Papal protection.)

We must at this point notice one highly significant parallel that seems to have escaped Dr. Conner's notice. When the Fathers of the Church got to work to spread their monopolistic brand of Christianity, they concocted, with typically Yiddish effrontery, an enormous hoax that imposed on their Christian dupes for centuries and challenges comparison with the Jews' recent Holohoax. The scurvy Fathers, by forgery and lying, put over the myth that the early Christians, sweet, innocent little lambs, had been persecuted by the wicked Romans for their pious faith.

The fact is that the Romans never harassed or troubled anyone for his religion, however absurd. The Romans did prosecute criminals, including revolutionary conspirators. Nero did execute a pack of Jewish Bolsheviks, known as Chrestiani, just as modern subversives are known as Marxists; the Chrestiani had confessed to setting the disastrous fire that destroyed a large part of Rome and killed thousands of Romans, and their execution was certainly proper. No reasonable person can object to it, although he may regret the excessive cruelty that pleased Romans who had just suffered loss of property and perhaps the death of loved ones.

When enough time had elapsed to obscure recollection of the event, the sneaking Fathers, by changing 'Chrestiani' to 'Christiani,'(9) made a martyr story of it so that they could whine about "persecution," and they supported it with ancillary hoaxes, including the hundreds of horror stories about "martyrs," tales that were invented by writers such as Jerome, who, in one of his letters, complains of the stupidity of a Christian contemporary, who thought that it mattered that the characters in the stories had never existed and the horrible incidents described had never taken place. The fiction served to propagate the "True Faith" and that was all that mattered. Jerome's attitude toward truth is simply typical of the whole gang of churchmen.(10)



(9. This may have had a basis in fact. The revolutionary agitator and terrorist named Chrestus probably did pose as a christ, and it is not impossible that the very earliest Christianity really was the nihilistic conspiracy masquerading as a cult of 'love,' like the bloody cults of 'brotherhood' today.)

(10. For thousands of examples of Christian hoaxes, see the admirable work of Joseph Wheless, *Forgery in Christianity* (New York, Knopf, 1930). Seven or eight years ago, a correspondent led me to believe that a reprint of this highly useful book was in preparation, but if it was published, I did not hear of it.)

"A domestic and secret enemy," observes Dr. Conner, "would never declare war openly. For the nation it would preach 'pacifism,' but practice private warfare against the Gentile citizenry of the state that shelters it. The Jew is able to make headway against the modern political state which must proceed by slow and legal processes, while Jewish methods and means are concentrated into hidden and dictatorial hands, garbed in a so-called religion. Its power is not in its own numbers, but in the members of Christian churches who have never yet been undeceived as to the true nature and objects of this alien cult."

That is indubitable, and it is certain that for fifteen centuries, despite the anti-Jewish animus of Western Christianity, the religion was the shield of the Jews in their depredations on European peoples, and it became their most powerful weapon in their subjugation and ruin of our race, which now appears irretrievably doomed to extinction by its own folly.

### TAKE YOUR CHOICE

Dr. Conner admits that the pure and elevating doctrines of kindness and justice, including the claim that "the Kingdom of Heaven is within you" (whatever that means), preached by the earnest and noble-souled peasant from Galilee, was much interpolated and altered by the Jews to facilitate their parasitism when they revised the gospels included in the "New Testament."

There remains one psychological problem. Granting that the message of 'Christ,' as it is generally understood, could not have been preached sincerely by a Jew, as Dr. Conner says, can we be certain that that doctrine, which appealed to our race, was not devised by Jews to bait a trap? One need not postulate an elaborate scheme plotted in advance. It could have been worked out experimentally and by tentative trial and error through control of the Fathers of Church until the design that had proved most effective in practice was put in definitive form no later than the Decretum Gelesianum, which was probably forged around 515, after which only minor improvements could be made.

As historians of religion, therefore, we are left with only the choice between two explanations. Either (a) the magnanimous Aryan peasant whom Dr. Conner calls 'Christ' did exist and did preach in vain to the Jews a lofty and idealistic message of justice and mercy which they and the Church corrupted and distorted, or (b) the whole tale, including the attractive parts of the doctrine attributed to a Jesus in the "New Testament," was a Jewish invention, designed as a vehicle to carry the lethal infection that eventually destroyed the Aryan mind and will, and, so far as can now be foreseen, has assured the extinction of the race the Jews hate most of all.

*This article originally appeared in **Liberty Bell** magazine, published monthly by George P. Dietz from September 1973 to February 1999. For reprint information*

*please write to [Liberty Bell Publications](#), Post Office Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA.*

Copyright ©2003 Kevin Alfred Strom. [Back to Revilo P. Oliver Index](#)